

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated March 12, 2004 (paper no. 8), the Examiner rejected claims 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner rejected claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Champion (U.S. patent no. 5,317,567, hereinafter referred to as "Champion1"), or Champion (U.S. patent no. 5,383,184, hereinafter referred to as "Champion2"), in view of Grube (U.S. patent no. 5,463,617). The Examiner allowed claims 1-10. The rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

The applicants respectfully thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-10.

The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, and more particularly as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner noted that the specification teaches that it is the subscribers that were not actively talking within the talkgroup that receive the summation of all subscribers that are actively talking. The applicants have amended claims 11 and 14 to conform the claims to the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

The Examiner rejected claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Champion1 or Champion2 in view of Grube. Claims 11, 12, and 14 provide for receiving inbound voice data from multiple subscriber units within a talkgroup, including from a first subscriber unit or an individual subscriber, transmitting first summed voice data including the voice data of the first subscriber unit or the individual subscriber to multiple subscriber units within the talkgroup via a shared first communication channel, and transmitting second summed voice data not including the voice data of the first subscriber unit or the individual subscriber to the first subscriber unit or individual subscriber via a second communication channel.

These limitations are not taught by any of Champion1, Champion 2, or Grube. Champion1 and Champion2 each teaches a wireline conference bridge-type system, wherein each participant in a conference call (telephones 101, 102, and 103) has his or her own individual input and output channels (modems 131 and 191 and interconnecting phone line 150 associated with telephone 101, modems 132 and 192 and interconnecting phone line 150 associated with telephone 102, and modems 133 and 193 and interconnecting phone line 150 associated with telephone 103). Thus, in Champion1 and Champion2, the information conveyed by the conference bridge to each conference call participant may be individually tailored for the participant, as each participant has his or her own non-shared connection. Champion1 and Champion2 then teach how to tailor the data for each participant, for example, multiplexing data of multiple speakers, for conveyance via each participant's individual connection.

The wireline systems of Champion1 and Champion2 impose a capacity constraint on bandwidth limited wireless systems, for example when a group call includes a significant number of participants, such as a wide area police call. In a wireless system, assigning an individual communication channel to each participant in a group call, via which individual channels information may be individually tailored for conveyance to the participant, may consume an excessive amount of capacity. Accordingly, wireless systems with talkgroup capability have the significant advantage of multicast, which cannot be implemented in wireline systems, wherein a central distribution point may convey voice information to all participants in the call via a single outbound RF channel shared by the participants. The issue then arises in a multicast system as to how to convey voice information to all participants in a multicast call involving a shared channel without conveying the voice information back to the source of the voice information. This problem does not arise in, nor is it addressed in, Champion1 or Champion2 as Champion1 and Champion2 teach nothing concerning a multicast system.

Claims 11, 12, and 14 teach a solution to this problem by providing that first summed voice data is transmitted to multiple non-talking subscriber units within the talkgroup via a shared first communication channel and second summed voice data is transmitted to the first subscriber unit via a second communication channel. Thus, claims

11, 12, and 14 maintain the efficiencies of multicasting that is unique to wireless communication systems while minimizing the problem of a conveyance of a speaker's own voice back to the speaker in a multicast call. Champion1 and Champion2 teach nothing concerning a multicast call and therefore cannot teach the limitations of claims 11, 12, and 14 of transmitting a first summed voice data to multiple non-talking subscriber units within the talkgroup via a first communication channel that is shared among the multiple non-talking subscriber units and transmitting a second summed voice data to the first subscriber unit via a second communication channel.

While Grube teaches wireless teleconferencing, Grube merely teaches a single outbound channel and therefore presents the very problem that is solved by the teachings of claims 11, 12, and 14. None of Champion1, Champion2, or Grube teaches how to utilize a shared channel available in a wireless multicast system to convey voice data to subscriber units within a talkgroup without conveying the talker's voice data back to the talker. Therefore, none of Champion1, Champion2, or Grube, individually or in combination, teach the features of claims 11, 12, and 14 of transmitting a first summed voice data to multiple non-talking subscriber units within the talkgroup other than the first subscriber unit via a first communication channel that is shared among the multiple non-talking subscriber units and transmitting a second summed voice data to the first subscriber unit via a second communication channel. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claims 11, 12, and 14 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claim 13 depends upon allowable claim 12, the applicants respectfully request that claim 13 may also be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,
Shaowei Pan et al.

By: 

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750